

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached formal drawing sheet for FIG. 5 is being submitted to replace the drawing for FIG. 5 currently on file. This replacement drawing now points reference numeral 504 to the --source device profile interpreter-- instead of the "destination device profile interpreter." This formal drawing contains no new subject matter.

Attachment: One (1) Replacement Sheet (FIG. 5).

REMARKS

This Amendment has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 28, 2006. According to Applicants' records, this Office Action is the eighth issued for this Application, of which only two were "final" Office Actions. Applicants note that the present Claims include substantially the same subject matter as originally filed. (See the Preliminary Amendment included with the application at filing.) The first final Office Action (dated March 26, 2003) had its finality withdrawn in view of a terminal disclaimer and newly discovered art from an additional search performed by the Examiner. The second final Office Action (dated August 10, 2005) kindly indicated that Claims 33-37 and 47-53 were allowable. In response to the second final Office Action, Applicants ultimately filed an RCE with an amendment attempting to leave only claims having subject matter indicated as being allowable. The present Office Action, however, includes several new rejections, none of which are based on prior art. Having repeatedly established the patentability of the claims over the art of record, Applicants are hopeful that the present Amendment adequately addresses the outstanding non-prior-art rejections and results in an indication that the now-pending claims are allowable.

Claims 33-37, 47-53, and 60-67 are pending. Claims 33-35, 47, and 51, which are the independent claims, have been amended as set for the below. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants submitted an information disclosure statement on September 16, 2004 requesting consideration of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,950. However, according to Applicants' records, they have not received an initialed copy of the 1449 form included therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that such initialed copy be provided to them. A copy of such Information Disclosure Statement, along with the stamped postcard indicating its receipt by the Patent Office on September 20, 2004 are enclosed herewith.

The Office Action includes an objection to the drawings for using both reference numerals 504 and 508 to refer to the same object in FIG. 5. Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion by having reference numeral 504 refer to the --source device profile interpreter-- as consonant with page 23,

lines 14-15 of the specification. A replacement sheet of FIG. 5 that includes this correction is enclosed herewith. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

The Office Action includes an objection to the specification for referring to a U.S. Patent Application at page 11, lines 10-13, and page 27, lines 8-10 without identifying the serial number of such application. Applicants have amended these portions of the specification to refer to the serial of this application, which is 08/884,411, now U.S. Patent No. 6,108,442. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this objection to the specification has been obviated and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

The specification also is objected to for its reference to an Appendix A at page 26, lines 1-5 because such Appendix is not in the Image File Wrapper. Without conceding the propriety of this objection, Applicants have deleted this reference to Appendix A. Accordingly, Applicants believe this objection has been obviated and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly not directed to statutory subject matter. Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have amended independent Claims 33-35, 47, and 51 to specify that one or more computers is required to implement or execute the recited systems/method. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least at page 4, lines 19-21; page 5, line 16 to page 6, line 4; and page 9, lines 9-19. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims comply with Section 101, and withdrawal of the corresponding rejections is respectfully requested.

All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. However, nearly all of the objected-to language is original to this application. In particular, the preliminary amendment included with this application at the time of filing provides written-description support for nearly all of the objected-to language. In particular, Claim 34 in the preliminary amendment provides written description support for present Claim 34; Claims 36 and 37 in the preliminary amendment provides written description support for present Claims 36 and 37, respectively; Claim 29 in the preliminary amendment provides written description support for present Claims 63 and 66; Claim 28 in the preliminary amendment

provides written description support for present Claims 62 and 65; Claim 30 in the preliminary amendment provides written description support for present Claims 64 and 67; Claims 26 and 27 in the preliminary amendment provide written description support for Claims 48, 49, 52, 53, 60, and 61; and Claim 33 in the preliminary amendment provides written description support for the corresponding language in Claims 33, 36, 37, 47-53, and 60-64. Additional written description support for present Claim 34 can be found in the specification at least at page 5, lines 1-8.


To further clarify these Claims, Applicants have amended Claims 33, 35, 47, and 51 to explicitly define what is meant by “adjusted coordinates.” Also, these claims have been amended to clarify that the color map is generated -- at least-- by adjusting coordinates in the destination device color space. Also, the last “wherein” clause of Claim 35 has been rewritten in an attempt to clarify its scope

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that the Section 112, first paragraph rejections have been addressed and respectfully request their withdrawal.

All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite. In particular, Claims 33, 47, and 51 were rejected because they allegedly do not claim ‘how’ errors should be reduced. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is asking Applicants to limit these claims to a particular embodiment and that Section 112, second paragraph includes no such requirement. The remaining Section 112, second paragraph rejections are believed to be addressed by the current amendments to the claims or the citations to the preliminary amendment discussed above, in connection with the Section 112, first paragraph rejections. For at least the above discussed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the §112, second paragraph rejections have been obviated, and their withdrawal is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of the present claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 52,118

Justin D. Petruzzelli/dn
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-726-7522
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.